



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,486	10/17/2003	Jock D. Mackinlay	131754	7949
27074 7590 08/13/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
LONG, ANDREA NATAE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com

jarnstrong@oliff.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/687,486
Filing Date: October 17, 2003
Appellant(s): MACKINLAY ET AL.

Linda M. Saltiel, Reg. No. 51,122
James Oliff, Reg. No. 27,075
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 06/30/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 08/13/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

User's Guide Microsoft Excel, Version 5, 1993-1994, pages 666-674

Jonathan Grudin, "Partitioning Digital Worlds: Focal and Peripheral Awareness in Multiple Monitor Use", SIGCHI'0, March 31- April 4, 2001, Volume 3 Issue 1 pages 458-465

Desney S. Tan and Mary Czerwinski, "Effects of visual Separation and Physical Discontinuities when Distributing Information across Multiple Displays", Human-Computer Interaction INTERACT 03, Press pages 252-255, Copyright IFIP, 2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12-18, 37, 39-42, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Excel (User's Guide Microsoft Excel, Version 5.0 1993), hereinafter "Excel".

As to independent claims 1 and 37, Excel teaches *a method of shifting attention* (page 666, Excel teaches using an auditing function "Tracers" to draw attention quickly to cells) *comprising the steps of:*

determining the location for a focus of attention (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active);

determining a display event (pages 667-668, Excel teaches using tracer arrows to connect related cells, which shows the flow of data from one cell to another);

determining the location of the display event (page 668, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows within a worksheet); and

determining an attention shifting display element based on the display event, the determined location of the display event and the focus of attention (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of tracing precedents or dependents); and

determining a distance between the focus of attention and the display event (page 669 – 671, Fig. 4, Excel teaches determining the distance “length of the tracer arrow”, from beginning active cell to the point of the arrow);

wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the determined distance, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances (page 669, Excel teaches displaying different tracer arrows depending on the tracer type).

As to dependent claim 3, Excel teaches wherein the *focus of attention is determined based on monitoring user actions* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 4, Excel teaches wherein *user actions are monitored based on a user selection tracking* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 5, Excel teaches wherein the *display event is associated with animated information* (page 668, Excel teaches tracer arrows are drawn to draw attention to different cells).

As to dependent claim 10, Excel teaches *determining a combination attention shifting display element based on a display event located more than a threshold distance from the focus of attention* (page 671, Figure 4, Excel teaches having the focus of attention having a combination of active cells to produce attention shifting display element (formula) from the multiple distances of each cell).

As to independent claims 12, 39, and 40, Excel teaches a method of *determining an attention shifting display element* (page 666, Excel teaches using an auditing function “Tracers” to draw attention quickly to cells) comprising the steps of:

determining a focus of attention (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active);

determining a location of a display event (page 668, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows within a worksheet);

determining an attention directing portion of an attention shifting display element based on a distance between the focus of attention and the location of the display event, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of

tracing precedents or dependents, further Excel teaches having different tracers which are visually distinctive).

As to dependent claim 13, Excel teaches *determining an attention attracting portion of an attention shifting display element based on the distance between the location of the display event and the location of the focus of attention* (page 668 –671, Fig. 4, Excel teaches determining the distance “length of the tracer arrow”, from beginning active cell to the point of the arrow, using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 14, Excel teaches *determining at least one information portion within the focus of attention, associated with the attention shifting display element, and where the information portion displays information associated with the display event* (page 668, Excel teaches the active cell having tracer arrows to draw the flow of data which is associated with a formula).

As to dependent claim 15, Excel teaches *where the information portion is a mathematical operator and a symbolic operator* (page 671, Fig 4 “formula”).

As to dependent claim 16, Excel teaches *where the attention shifting display element is dynamically determined based on continued focus of attention on a display region* (page 671,

Fig 4, Excel teaches that based on the active cell with the worksheet a tracer can show association between the active cell and its associated formula.

As to dependent claim 17, Excel teaches *where the continued focus of attention is determined based on user monitoring* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 18, Excel teaches *where the attention shifting display element is dynamically determined based on continued focus of attention on the display event and wherein the display event is based on a mouse event* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 41, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 42, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 45, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 46, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 47, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19, 21-23, 28, 30-36, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Excel (User's Guide Microsoft Excel, Version 5.0 1993), hereinafter "Excel".

As to independent claim 19, Excel teaches *a system of shifting attention* (page 666, Excel teaches using an auditing function "Tracers" to draw attention quickly to cells) *comprising: receiving a display event information* (page 669, user selection of cells), *determining a focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active), *determining the location of the display event* (page 668, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows within a worksheet), *determining an attention shifting display element based on the display event information, the location of the display event and the location of the focus of attention* (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of tracing precedents or dependents), and *determining a distance between the focus of attention and the display event* (page 669-671, Fig. 4, Excel teaches determining the distance "length of the tracer arrow", from beginning active cell to the point of the arrow); *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the determined distance, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances* (page 669, Excel teaches displaying different tracer arrows depending on the tracer type). While Excel does not explicitly state *an input/output circuit, a memory, a processor, and circuits*, it is well known and reasonably understood that Excel was created to run and be executed on a computer

Art Unit: 2176

system. It is also well known that most computer systems contain input/output circuits, some type of memory (cache, RAM, ROM), a processor, and circuits.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was to have used a computer system that contains input/output circuits, some type of memory (cache, RAM, ROM), a processor, and circuits with to allow for implementation of the above determining functions.

As to dependent claim 21, Excel teaches wherein the *focus of attention is determined based on monitoring user actions* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 22, Excel teaches wherein *user actions are monitored based on a user selection tracking* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 23, Excel teaches wherein the *display event is associated with animated information* (page 668, Excel teaches tracer arrows are drawn to draw attention to different cells).

As to dependent claim 28, Excel teaches *determining a combination attention shifting display element based on a display event located more than a threshold distance from the focus of attention* (page 671, Figure 4, Excel teaches having the focus of attention having a

combination of active cells to produce attention shifting display element (formula) from the multiple distances of each cell).

As to independent claim 30, Excel teaches *a system of determining an attention shifting display element* (page 666, Excel teaches using an auditing function “Tracers” to draw attention quickly to cells), *which determines the focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active), *determines the location of the display event* (page 668, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows within a worksheet), and *determines an attention directing portion of an attention shifting display event based on a distance between the focus of attention and the location of the display event, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances* (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of tracing precedents or dependents). While Excel does not explicitly state circuits to perform these tasks, it is well known and reasonably understood that Excel was created to run and be executed on a computer system. It is also well know that most computer systems contain circuits.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was to have used a computer systems that contain circuits to allow for implementation of the above determining functions.

As to dependent claim 31, Excel teaches *determining an attention attracting portion of an attention shifting display element based on the distance between the location of the display*

event and the location of the focus of attention (page 668 –671, Fig. 4, Excel teaches determining the distance “length of the tracer arrow”, from beginning active cell to the point of the arrow, using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 32, Excel teaches *determining at least one information portion within the focus of attention, associated with the attention shifting display element, and where the information portion displays information associated with the display event (page 668, Excel teaches the active cell having tracer arrows to draw the flow of data which is associated with a formula).*

As to dependent claim 33, Excel teaches *where the information portion is a mathematical operator and a symbolic operator (page 671, Fig 4 “formula”).*

As to dependent claim 34, Excel teaches *where the attention shifting display element is dynamically determined based on continued focus of attention on a display region (page 671, Fig 4, Excel teaches that based on the active cell with the worksheet a tracer can show association between the active cell and its associated formula.*

As to dependent claim 35, Excel teaches *where the continued focus of attention is determined based on user monitoring (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).*

As to dependent claim 36, Excel teaches *where the attention shifting display element is dynamically determined based on continued focus of attention on the display event and wherein the display event is based on a mouse event* (pages 669-670, Excel teaches clicking on cells to activate them).

As to dependent claim 43, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

As to dependent claim 44, Excel teaches *wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the location of the display event and the determined distance* (page 668-671, Excel teaches using the tracer arrows to trace the flow of data from one cell to another within a worksheet).

Claims 7, 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Excel further in view of Jonathan Grudin (Partitioning Digital Worlds: Focal and Peripheral Awareness in Multiple Monitor Use, 2001), hereinafter “Grudin”.

As to dependent claim 7, Excel teaches the *distance between the focus of attention and display event*. However, Excel does not teach *wherein the distance between the focus of*

attention and display event includes at least one non-sensible portion. Grudin teaches including a non-sensible portion (page 460 1st paragraph). Grudin teaches that it is well known that multiple displays do not connect seamlessly.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have inferred that if multiple monitors were in use the display of information would contain at least one seam.

As to dependent claim 9, Excel teaches *determining the attention shifting display element* (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of tracing precedents or dependents). Excel also teaches a *dynamic attention shifting display element* (page 668, the active cell) and a *static shifting display element* (page 668, the resulting formula). However, Excel does not teach *determining a dynamic attention shifting display element based on a display event located at the periphery of attention and determining a static attention shifting display element based on a display event located at the focus of attention.* Grudin teaches using one monitor for focal attention and the second monitor for periphery awareness (page 464, 2nd column 2nd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the attention shifting of Excel with the focal and periphery attention of Grudin to maximize the use and capabilities of a spreadsheet and to increase the opportunity to design suites of awareness and notification features that draw on the full range of communication and agent software that a person selects.

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Excel (User's Guide Microsoft Excel, Version 5.0 1993), hereinafter "Excel" in further view of Jonathan Grudin (Partitioning Digital Worlds: Focal and Peripheral Awareness in Multiple Monitor Use, 2001), hereinafter "Grudin".

As to dependent claim 25, Excel teaches the *distance between the focus of attention and display event*. However, Excel does not teach *wherein the distance between the focus of attention and display event includes at least one non-sensible portion*. Grudin teaches including a non-sensible portion (page 460 1st paragraph). Grudin teaches that it is well known that multiple displays do not connect seamlessly.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have inferred that if multiple monitors were in use the display of information would contain at least one seam.

As to dependent claim 27, Excel teaches *determining the attention shifting display element* (pages 668-669, Figures 1 and 2, Excel teaches displaying tracer arrows to show the flow of data into a formula, based on the starting active cell within a worksheet, and the users choice of tracing precedents or dependents). Excel also teaches a *dynamic attention shifting display element* (page 668, the active cell) and a *static shifting display element* (page 668, the resulting formula). However, Excel does not teach *determining a dynamic attention shifting display element based on a display event located at the periphery of attention and determining a static attention shifting display element based on a display event located at the focus of*

attention. Grudin teaches using one monitor for focal attention and the second monitor for periphery awareness (page 464, 2nd column 2nd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the attention shifting of Excel with the focal and periphery attention of Grudin to maximize the use and capabilities of a spreadsheet and to increase the opportunity to design suites of awareness and notification features that draw on the full range of communication and agent software that a person selects.

Claims 6, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Excel as modified by Grudin further in view of Tan et al. (Effects of Visual Separation and Physical Discontinuities when Distributing Information across Multiple Displays, 2003, *motivational purposes only*), hereinafter “Tan”.

As to dependent claim 6, Excel teaches *a focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active) and *a display event* (pages 667-668, Excel teaches using tracer arrows to connect related cells, which shows the flow of data from one cell to another). However, Excel does not teach wherein *the focus of attention is located on a first display and the display event is located on a second display*. Grudin teaches using multiple integrated displays to present information (page 459 “Dual or multiple monitors”).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the display event and focus of attention of Excel with the multiple displays of

Grudin to allow the system to present information across much wider visual angels than before and to provide abundant display space as disclosed by Tan (page 1 “Introduction”).

As to dependent claim 8, Excel as modified by Grudin in further view of Tan teaches wherein *the distance between the focus of attention and the display event are displayed on multiple screens*. Grudin further teaches one *non-sensible portion*.

As to dependent claim 11, Excel teaches *a focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active) and *a display event* (pages 667-668, Excel teaches using tracer arrows to connect related cells, which shows the flow of data from one cell to another). However, Excel does not teach wherein *the focus of attention is located on a first display and the display event is located on a second display*. Grudin teaches using multiple integrated displays to present information (page 459 “Dual or multiple monitors”).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the display event and focus of attention of Excel with the multiple displays of Grudin to allow the system to present information across much wider visual angels than before and to provide abundant display space as disclosed by Tan (page 1 “Introduction”).

Claims 24, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Excel as modified by Grudin further in view of Tan et al. (Effects of Visual Separation and Physical Discontinuities when Distributing Information across Multiple Displays, 2003, *motivational purposes only*), hereinafter “Tan”.

As to dependent claim 24, Excel teaches *a focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active) and *a display event* (pages 667-668, Excel teaches using tracer arrows to connect related cells, which shows the flow of data from one cell to another). However, Excel does not teach wherein *the focus of attention is located on a first display and the display event is located on a second display*. Grudin teaches using multiple integrated displays to present information (page 459 “Dual or multiple monitors”).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the display event and focus of attention of Excel with the multiple displays of Grudin to allow the system to present information across much wider visual angles than before and to provide abundant display space as disclosed by Tan (page 1 “Introduction”).

As to dependent claim 26, Excel as modified by Grudin in further view of Tan teaches wherein *the distance between the focus of attention and the display event are displayed on multiple screens*. Grudin further teaches one *non-sensible portion*.

As to dependent claim 29, Excel teaches *a focus of attention* (page 669, Excel teaches selecting a cell to become active) and *a display event* (pages 667-668, Excel teaches using tracer arrows to connect related cells, which shows the flow of data from one cell to another). However, Excel does not teach wherein *the focus of attention is located on a first display and the display event is located on a second display*. Grudin teaches using multiple integrated displays to present information (page 459 “Dual or multiple monitors”).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the display event and focus of attention of Excel with the multiple displays of Grudin to allow the system to present information across much wider visual angles than before and to provide abundant display space as disclosed by Tan (page 1 “Introduction”).

(10) Response to Argument

Beginning on page 12 of Appellant's Appeal Brief (hereinafter the Brief), Appellant argues the following issues which are accordingly addressed below.

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12-18, 37, 39-42 Are Not Anticipated By Microsoft Excel

Appellant argues that Excel fails to disclose or suggest determining a distance between the focus of attention and the display event, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 37 and 39. Specifically, Appellant argues that the step of determining the distance is not taught or suggested by Excel. Instead Excel discloses tracers that "track data flow by drawing arrows connecting the active cell with related cells on your worksheet". Additionally Excel lacks any teachings taking into consideration the physical size of the display, thereby being impossible for Excel to disclose determining the distance. *See brief – Pages 12 and 13.*

The Examiner disagrees.

The disputed claim language reads:

A method of shifting attention comprising the steps of:

determining the location for the focus of attention;

determining a display event;

determining the location of the display event;

determining an attention shifting display element based on the display, the

determined location of the display event and the focus of attention; and

*determining a distance between the focus of attention and the display event;
wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the
determined distance, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are
determined for different distances.*

Emphasis added. See Claim 1.

Excel allows a user to enter values and formulas into the cells of a spreadsheet. Excel also allows the user to highlight a cell in the spreadsheet. This highlighted cell is the “active” cell (i.e., the cell having “focus”).

For any formula associated with the active cell, Excel allows the user to “trace” related cells that are also associated with the formula. When the “tracing” functionality is used, Excel automatically draws “tracer” lines between the active cell and its related cells. Excel also automatically draws “tracer” arrows that show the direction of the flow of data (i.e., data flows “into” the formula). See Fig. 4 on Page 671 and Fig. 5 on Page 672 in the Excel reference.

In order for Excel to automatically draw the “tracer” lines and arrows, the software application makes at least three determinations:

- 1) the location of the “active” cell;
- 2) the location of each “related” cell; and
- 3) the direction of the flow of data between the “active” cell and the “related” cells.

Because Excel automatically makes these determinations and then automatically draws the “tracer” lines and arrows between the “active” cell and the “related” cells, Excel discloses determining a distance between the “focus of attention” (i.e., the active cell) and the “display

event" (i.e., the drawing of the "tracer" lines and arrows between the "active" cell and the "related" cells).

In Excel, the "tracer" lines may vary in appearance depending upon the location of a "related" cell with respect to the "active" cell (which is always located within the spreadsheet being viewed by the user). For example, when the "related" cell is the same spreadsheet as the "active" cell, Excel draws a solid blue line between the cells; conversely, when the "related" cell is a different spreadsheet as the "active" cell, Excel draws a dashed black line having an icon between the cells. See the Table at the bottom of Page 669 in the Excel reference.

In other words, Excel automatically selects either the solid blue line or the dashed black line having an icon, based upon the location of the "active" cell and the location of the "related" cell (i.e., the distance between the "active" cell and the "related" cell), and draws it between the cells. Thus, if the distance between the "active" cell and the "related" cell is so great that the "related" cell is on another spreadsheet, then Excel draws a dashed black line having an icon between the cells; otherwise, Excel draws a solid blue line between the cells.

Stated differently, with respect to the "active" cell, all "related" cells located beyond a threshold distance are connected to the "active" cell via dashed black lines having icons and all "related" cells located within a threshold distance are connected to the "active" cell via solid blue lines.

Accordingly, Excel discloses that the "*attention shifting display element*" (i.e., the "tracer" lines and arrows automatically drawn between the "active" cell and the "related" cells) is determined based on the "*determined distance*" (i.e., the distances between the "active" cell

and the “related” cells) and that different types of “*attention shifting display elements*” (i.e., **solid blue lines** versus **dashed black lines having icons**) are determined for different distances.

Regarding Appellant’s argument that Excel fails to disclose or suggest taking into consideration the physical size of the display, it is noted that the feature upon which Appellant relies is **not** recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Appellant additionally argues that Excel fails to disclose or suggest wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the determined distance such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances. Further Appellant argues that Excel bases its tracer type on the conditions of the originating cell and not a determined distance.

The Examiner disagrees.

Excel teaches three types of tracer arrows defined as Formula, Error, and External reference or references to another sheet in the same workbook. A different physical display is generated for each type of tracer arrow. Excel's use of a dashed black line with icon to represent

a reference to another sheet in the same workbook provides for the teaching of an attention shifting display element based on a determined distance. This particular tracer arrow is displayed when it is determined that there is a reference outside of the current sheet to another sheet, which implies that the system recognizes that the reference cell is located outside of the sheet and therefore recognizes the distance as being located out of the sheet.

Additionally the various lengths of the tracer arrows can be visually interpreted as different types of attention shifting display elements, being that they are visually distinguishable by length and as discussed above the length of the tracer arrows requires a calculation to determine the distance from the starting cell to the ending cell in order to draw the tracer arrows.

B. Claims 19, 21-23, 28, 30-36, 43 and 44 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Microsoft Excel.

As discussed in section A, above, Excel discloses the similarly recited claimed features of that of claim 1 and therefore claims 19 and 30 and its dependent claims are not patentable over Excel.

**C. Claims 7, 9, 25 and 27 Would Not Have Been Obvious over
Microsoft Excel in View of Grudin.**

Claims 7 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and 25 and 27 depend from independent claim 19. Claims 1 and 19 are not patentable over Excel for the reasons as discussed above and therefore, claim 7, 9, 25 and 27 also are not patentable over Excel and Grudin for at least the same reasons.

**D. Claims 6, 8, 11, 24, 26, and 29 Would Not Have Been Obvious over
Microsoft Excel in View of Grudin and in further view of Tan.**

Claims 6, 8, 11, 24, 26 and 29 depend from independent claim 1 and 19, respectively. Claims 1 and 19 are not patentable over Excel for the reasons as discussed above and therefore, claim 8, 11, 24, 26 and 29 also are not patentable over Excel, Grudin and Tan for at least the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2176

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrea N Long/

Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Conferees:

/Doug Hutton/

Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

/Rachna S Desai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176